

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are the only independent claims.

Present amendment

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the first cutting pattern cuts deeply right through the sheet but does not form a detached element, and the second pattern also cuts deeply right through the sheet.

Support for the added recitation is found in the original application, for example, at least page 6, lines 8-14 (pub. paragraph 0048).

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended accordingly.

Art rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-13, 16, 18, and 20-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 5,697,649 to Dames et al. ("Dames") in view of US 3,641,853 to Jungbeck ("Jungbeck").

Further, claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Dames in view of Jungbeck and further in view of US 6,350,342 to Steidinger et al. ("Steidinger'342").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Jungbeck discloses a cutting system with two successive rollers, but the **first roller of Jungbeck makes a partial cut through only a portion of the thickness of the substrate**, leaving another portion of the thickness uncut, while the second roller then cuts through the remaining portion of the depth.

Accordingly, in Jungbeck, the first roller never cuts right through the substrate, but “only to a portion of the material thickness” (Jungbeck at col. 3, lines 18-19), more precisely “to a depth of about 30 to 50 percent of its thickness” (Jungbeck at col. 3, lines 6-10).

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, **the first cutting pattern cuts deeply right through the sheet** but does not form a detached element, and the second pattern also cuts deeply right through the sheet in an intersecting pattern, to form the detached element, as recited in present claims 1, 12, and 13.

Thus, the partial “deep through” cuts in the presently claimed invention are very different from the partial cuts through only a portion of the depth, as in Jungbeck. Jungbeck does not provide any incentive or motivation to cut deeply right through the sheet with the first partial cut. Indeed, this would destroy the effectiveness of the method of Jungbeck which is to start a partial cut through only a portion of the depth in a “scoring” step (Jungbeck at col. 3, line 11), then finish by cutting completely through the substrate, along the same cutting line, in a “severing” step (Jungbeck at col. 3, line 20). Namely, the second cutting (“severing”) step of Jungbeck would have no purpose if the first cutting (“scoring”) step of Jungbeck had already cut deeply right through the substrate.

Also, the partial cuts of Jungbeck are necessarily superposed so the second partial cut can finish cutting the portion of the sheet thickness that has not been cut by the first, shallow partial cut, so that the cutting line is cut through the substrate.

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the first and second cutting patterns are each performed deep through the sheet and they intersect so as to constitute a resulting pattern that forms a detached element, as recited in present claim 1.

In addition, the “first partial-depth and second remaining-depth” partial cuts of Jungbeck require a complex adjustment of the cutting depth and alignment of cylinders, whereas the “deeply right through” intersecting partial cuts of the presently claimed invention make it possible to cut complex shapes of small-size elements easily with comparatively simple adjustment of the cylinder synchronization (for example, without relative shallow partial cutting depth adjustment as imperatively required in Jungbeck).

The feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught or suggested in Jungbeck. As a result, Jungbeck fails to remedy the deficiencies of Dames in this respect. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over any combination of Dames and Jungbeck.

In addition, with respect to the dependent claims, it is submitted that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the combined features of each of these respective claims.

Therefore, each of the dependent claims is not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

Application No. **10/589,001**
Art Unit: **3725**

Amendment under 37 CFR §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: **062842**

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/ya